

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS KRISTIN K. MAYES - Chairman **GARY PIERCE** PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY **BOB STUMP** 5 6 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY, AND FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO ITS RATES AND CHARGES FOR UTILITY SERVICE AND FOR CERTAIN RELATED APPROVALS 10 BASED THEREON. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19

+ 2009 JUN 26 A 9: 55

AZ COMP COLONISSION

DOCKET NO. W-01445A-08-0440

STAFF'S NOTICE OF FILING COST OF SERVICE DIRECT TESTIMONY AND REQUEST FOR BRIEF EXTENSION OF RATE DESIGN TESTIMONY

Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Staff") hereby files the Cost of Service Direct Testimony of Staff Witness Steven Olea, in the above-referenced matter.

While Staff's Rate Design Direct Testimony was also due today. Staff hereby requests an additional two (2) business days to file this testimony. This additional time is needed as a result of unforeseen factors/complexities concerning the consolidation of several systems. Staff has conferred with all parties regarding this late filing and they have no objection to the June 30, 2009, filing of its Rate Design Direct Testimony.

Staff, in turn, agrees to extend the filing deadline by an additional two (2) business days for the parties to file Rate Design Rebuttal Testimony, should the other parties need it. However, Staff is recommending that all other filing deadlines shall remain unchanged.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 26th day of June, 2009.

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

eith, ch

DOCKETED BY

an Cleve, Staff Counsel Wesley C. Vall Cleve, Staff Connect L. Scott, Staff Counsel

Legal Division

Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

(602) 542-3402

1	Original and thirteen (13) copies of the foregoing were filed this
2	26 <sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009 with:
3	Docket Control
4	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
6	Copy of the foregoing mailed this
7	26 <sup>th</sup> day of <u>June</u> , 2009 to:
8	Robert W. Geake ARIZONA WATER COMPANY Post Office Box 29006
9	Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9006
10	Norman D. James Jay L. Shapiro
11	FÉNNEMÔRE CRAIG
12	3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
13	Michelle L. Wood
14	RUCO 1110 West Washington, Suite 220
15	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
16	Nicholas J. Enoch Jarrett J. Haskovec
17	LUBIN & ENOCH, P.C. 349 North Fourth Avenue
18	Phoenix, Arizona 85003
19	Michele Van Quathem RYLEY, CARLOCK & APPLEWHITE
20	One North Central Avenue, Suite 1200 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4417
21	
22/	Joseann Osorio
ر 23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	v

# (COST OF SERVICE)

**DIRECT** 

**TESTIMONY** 

**OF** 

STEVE M. OLEA

**DOCKET NO. W-01445A-08-0440** 

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASE IN ITS WATER RATES AND CHARGES FOR UTILITY SERVICES

#### BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Chairman	
GARY PIERCE	
Commissioner	
PAUL NEWMAN	•
Commissioner	
SANDRA D. KENNEDY	
Commissioner	
BOB STUMP	
Commissioner	
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATIONS OF )	DOCKET NO. V

ARIZONA WATER OF THE APPLICATIONS OF ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY, AND FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO ITS RATES AND CHARGES FOR UTILITY SERVICE AND FOR CERTAIN RELATED APPROVALS BASED THEREON

KRISTIN K. MAYES

DOCKET NO. W-01445A-08-0440

DIRECT

**TESTIMONY** 

OF

STEVEN M. OLEA

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

**UTILITIES DIVISION** 

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	3
COST OF SERVICE STUDY	4
SCHEDULES	
CASA GRANDE COST OF SERVICE STUDY – PRESENT REVENUE	SMO-1
CASA GRANDE COST OF SERVICE STUDY – PROPOSED REVENUE	SMO-2

1

#### **INTRODUCTION**

2 3 0.

Q.

A. Steven M. Olea, 1200 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007.

Please state your name and business address.

4

- 5
- I am employed by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") as the Assistant 6 A.

By whom and in what capacity are you employed?

7 Director for the Utilities Division ("Division").

8

Q. Please state your educational background.

10

11

9

- I graduated from Arizona State University ("ASU") in 1976 with a Bachelors Degree in Civil A. Engineering. From 1976 to 1978, I obtained 47 graduate hours of credit in Environmental
- 12 Engineering at ASU.

13

Please state your pertinent work experience. Q.

15

14

From April 1978 to October 1978, I worked for the Engineering Services Section of the A.

16

Bureau of Air Quality Control in the Arizona Department of Health Services ("ADHS"). My

17

responsibilities were to inspect air pollution sources to determine compliance with ADHS

18

rules and regulations.

19

20

From November 1978 to July 1982, I was with the Technical Review Unit of the Bureau of

21

Water Quality Control ("BWQC") in ADHS (this is now part of the Arizona Department of

22

Environmental Quality ["ADEQ"]). My responsibilities were to review water and

23

wastewater construction plans for compliance with ADHS rules, regulations, and

24

Engineering Bulletins.

From July 1982 to August 1983, I was with the Central Regional Office, BWQC, ADHS. My responsibilities were to conduct construction inspections of water and wastewater facilities to determine compliance with plans approved by the Technical Review Unit. I also performed routine operation and maintenance inspections to determine compliance with ADHS rules and regulations, and compliance with United States Environmental Protection Agency requirements.

From August 1983 to August 1986, I was a Utilities Consultant/Water-Wastewater Engineer with the Division. My responsibilities were to provide engineering analyses of Commission regulated water and wastewater utilities for rate cases, financing cases, and consumer complaint cases. I also provided testimony at hearings for those cases.

From August 1986 to August 1990, I was the Engineering Supervisor for the Division. My primary responsibility was to oversee the activities of the Engineering Section, which included one technician and eight Utilities Consultants. The Utilities Consultants included one Telecommunications Engineer, three Electrical Engineers, and four Water-Wastewater Engineers. I also assisted the Chief Engineer and performed some of the same tasks as I did as a Utilities Consultant.

In August 1990, I was promoted to the position of Chief Engineer. My duties were somewhat the same as when I was the Engineering Supervisor, except that now I was less involved with the day-to-day supervision of the Engineering Staff and more involved with the administrative and policy aspects of the Engineering Section.

1 2

In April 2000, I was promoted to my present position as one of two Assistant Directors of the

Division. In this position, I assist the Division Director in the policy aspects of the Division.

I am primarily responsible for matters dealing with water and energy.

#### **PURPOSE**

- Q. What was your assignment in this case?
- A. My assignment was to review the Cost of Service Study ("COSS") performed by Arizona Water Company ("AZ Water" or "Company").
- Q. What is the purpose of this prefiled testimony?
- A. This testimony will discuss my review of AZ Water's COSS and present the results of that review along with Staff's recommendations.
- Q. Have you reviewed or prepared COSSs in the past or as part of your duties at the Commission?
- A. Yes, I have prepared and/or reviewed COSSs for water, sewer, electric and natural gas utilities. Some of these cases include Arizona Water Company rate cases (Docket Nos. U-1445-85-037 and U-1445-91-227), Arizona Sierra Utility Company (Docket No. U-2140-87-219), Graham County Electric Cooperative (Docket No. U-1749-92-298), Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (Docket No. U-1575-92-220), and Southwest Gas Corporation (Docket No. U-1551-86-300). This is not an all-inclusive listing.

4

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

### Q. Was rate design part of your assignment?

A. Rate design should not be confused with COSS. A COSS is the allocation of only costs to each customer class. Rate design involves the allocation of revenues to each customer class along with the development of the particular rate to achieve that revenue. The COSS is only one of many factors that is considered when allocating revenues. Once the revenue allocation is completed, then specific rates are designed to collect those revenues. Staff's primary rate design witness in this case is Mr. Jeffrey Michlik. I assisted Mr. Michlik in developing specific Residential rates for some of the systems.

#### **COST OF SERVICE STUDY**

### Q. What is a Cost of Service Study?

A. In very simple terms, a COSS is an estimation of cost-causation by customer class, i.e. how much does it cost the utility to provide its service to each specific customer class. The reason for determining the costs incurred by the utility to serve each customer class is to assist in allocating the revenue requirement for each customer class.

For each type utility, there are several generally accepted methods for conducting a COSS. There is no one "correct" COSS method, but rather a range of reasonable alternatives. This is not to suggest that COSSs are arbitrary; some allocations are clearly more reasonable than others. This is the reason a COSS should only be used as a general guide and as one of several considerations in allocating revenue requirements and designing rates.

Company in this case?

1

Α.

A.

#### Q. What was the process you used in reviewing the Company's COSS?

2

looked at specific items within the COSS; primarily the allocation factors (for Commodity,

I began by reviewing the overall cost of service methodology used by the Company. I then

4

Demand, Customer, and Direct Private Fire) used by AZ Water.

5

6

#### Q. Did you conduct a separate, independent COSS?

7

No, I did not. I reviewed the Company's COSS by looking specifically at the COSS for the Casa Grande System only. I looked at this system in particular because it contains the most

8

overall customer diversity, i.e., a mixture of Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Direct

10

Private Fire. Since the Company used the same COSS method for all its systems, reviewing

11

the COSS for Casa Grande would be representative of the Company's overall COSS.

12

Therefore, all Staff's comments in this testimony, regarding AZ Water's COSS, are based

13

solely on my review of the Company's Casa Grande COSS.

14

15

# Q. What are Staff's findings regarding the overall cost of service methodology used by the

16

17

A.

The two most generally accepted COSS methods used in the water industry are the Base-

18

Extra Capacity Method and the Commodity-Demand Method as outlined in the American

19

Water Works Association Manual M1, "Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges". For

20

this case, the Company chose the method which I have usually used in the past, which is the

21

Commodity-Demand Method. The Commodity-Demand Method breaks the costs of

22

providing water service into four primary cost components: commodity costs (costs that tend

23

to vary with the amount of water), demand costs (costs associated with peak use/demand),

customer costs (costs not associated with water use, e.g., billing) and direct fire protection costs. I find the Company's use of the Commodity-Demand Method in this case to be appropriate.

4 |

# Q. What are Staff's conclusions regarding the Company's COSS allocation factors?

A. Staff is in agreement with the allocation factors used by AZ Water except for those involving General Plant, Water Treatment Expenses, and Transmission & Distribution ("T&D") Expenses.

### Q. Please explain.

A. Please refer to Schedule G-7:

For Water Treatment Expenses, I allocated 90 percent to Commodity and 10 percent to Demand (Company used 48 percent Commodity and 52 percent Demand). I used this allocation because I believe that Water Treatment Expenses will fluctuate primarily with the amount of water sold.

For Transmission & Distribution Expenses, I allocated 10 percent to Commodity and 90 percent to Demand (Company used 42 percent Demand and 58 percent Customer). I used this allocation because I believe that T&D Expenses will fluctuate in the same proportion as T&D Mains, T&D Land and Storage, which the Company and I both allocated 10 percent to Commodity and 90 percent to Demand.

For General Plant Land and General Plant Structures, I allocated 10 percent to Commodity and 90 percent to Demand (Company allocated 100 percent Demand). I used this allocation because I believe this plant should be allocated in the same manner as T&D Mains, T&D Land, Storage, Intangible Plant, Source of Supply Plant, Pumping Plant and Water Treatment Plant, which the Company and I both allocated 10 percent to Commodity and 90 percent to Demand.

Leasehold Improvements, Office Furniture & Equipment, Warehouse Equipment, Tools, Shop & Garage Equipment, Laboratory Equipment, Power Operated Equipment, Communication Equipment, and Miscellaneous Equipment, I allocated the same as the Subtotal T&D Plant. The Company allocated all these items as 100 percent Customer, except for Power Operated Equipment and Communication Equipment, which AZ Water allocated 25 percent to Demand. I used this allocation because I believe that all this type general plant should be allocated in the same proportion as T&D Plant and not based on the number of customers.

### Q. Did you make any other adjustments to AZ Water's Casa Grande COSS?

A. Yes, I made the adjustments recommended by Staff with regard to expenses and plant.

# Q. Please explain.

A. For Wells, I deducted \$1,056,318 from the Company's \$5,758,437, per the adjustment on Staff Schedule BKB-2 (Schedule G-7).

10

32

34

On Schedule G-6, I made the following adjustments:

For Transmission & Distribution Expenses, I deducted \$303,588 from the Company's \$1,887,995, per Staff Schedule AII-4.

For Depreciation & Amortization Expenses, I deducted \$225,735 from the Company's \$2,329,760, per Staff Schedule AII-4.

For Income Taxes at Present Rates, I added \$236,522 and \$52,103 to the Company's negative \$549,326, per Staff Schedule AII-4.

For Property Taxes, I deducted \$131,347 from the Company's \$806,467, per Staff Schedule AII-4.

On Schedule G-5, I made the following adjustments:

For Source of Supply Plant, I deducted \$1,056,318 from the Company's \$6,113,706, per Staff Schedule BKB-2.

For Accumulated Depreciation, I deducted \$812,369 from the Company's \$17,639,046, per Staff Schedule BKB-2.

For Customer Deposits, I added a Line to Schedule G-5 (the Company did not include a Line for Customer Deposits) and added \$252,738, per Staff Schedule BKB-2.

For Working Capital, I deducted \$208,846 from the Company's \$383,959, per Staff Schedule BKB-2.

For Net Regulatory Asset/(Liability), I deducted \$14,289 from the Company's \$575,803, per Staff Schedule BKB-2.

- With the adjustments Staff made to allocation factors, expenses and plant discussed Q. above, what differences are there between the results of Staff's COSS and AZ Water's?
- In each of the G-1 Schedules, COSS at test year revenues, the specific numbers are different; A. however, the results of two COSSs could be considered the same.

#### Q. Please explain.

- A. The Company's overall rate of return on its Schedule G-1 for Casa Grande is 1.59 percent, while Staff's is 2.54 percent. Both are below Staff's recommended 8.1 percent. Each of the individual customer class rates of return are on the same side of the overall rate of return for each COSS. What I mean by this is that for:
  - 1) The Residential class for Staff has a rate of return lower than Staff's overall rate of return and the Residential class for AZ Water has a lower rate of return than the Company's overall rate of return.
  - 2) The Commercial class for Staff has a rate of return higher than Staff's overall rate of return and the Commercial class for AZ Water has a higher rate of return than the Company's overall rate of return.
  - 3) The Industrial class for Staff has a rate of return higher than Staff's overall rate of return and the Industrial class for AZ Water has a higher rate of return than the Company's overall rate of return.
  - 4) The Other class for Staff has a rate of return higher than Staff's overall rate of return and the Other class for AZ Water has a higher rate of return than the Company's overall rate of return.
  - 5) The Direct Private Fire class for Staff has a rate of return lower than Staff's overall rate of return and the Direct Private Fire class for AZ Water has a lower rate of return than the Company's overall rate of return.

The above information is the basis for my conclusion that the overall results of the two COSSs are the same, even with the adjustments made by Staff.

# Q. Did you review all aspects of the Company's COSS?

A. No.

# Q. Please explain.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

A. I only reviewed the basic portions of the AZ Water's COSS. For Schedule G-1, I did not review anything below Line 25 nor did I review anything on the second page of Schedule G-1. For Schedule G-2, I did not review anything below Line 24. For Schedule G-3, I did not review anything below Line 24 on the first page. For Schedule G-4, I did not review anything below Line 30. For Schedule G-6, I did not review anything below Line 29.

# Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

Operating Revenues Water Revenues (Sch. H-1) Miscellaneous Revenues¹ (Sch. H-1) Total Operating Revenues Operating Expenses Operating Expenses Operations & Maintenance Expense Depreciation & Amortization Expense Income Taxes Property Taxes Other Taxes Total Operating Expenses Taxable Income Net Operating Income	Casa Grande	[8] [C] [D] [E]	Adjusted Direct Direct I <u>Diai</u> Residential Commercial Industrial Other Private Fire	\$ 10,345,272 \$ 6,578,153 \$ 2,217,948 \$ 1,085,226 \$ 450,777 \$	589,682 374,956 126,418 61,858	\$ 6,953,109 \$ 2,344,266 \$ 1,7		7,168,065 5,234,586 1,244,124 381,444 278,894	2,104,025 1,648,097 306,200	(594,934) 133,112 217,796	429,283 144,734 70,821		\$ 6,877,212 \$ 1,866,240 \$ 719,822 \$	(735,739) (1,678,996) 375,662 614,655 21,434	\$ 1,029,099 \$ 75,897 \$ 478,026 \$ 427,262 \$ 75,049 \$	1,504,137 1,159,959 235,475 30,403 61,211	the state of the s
				Operating Revenues Water Revenues (Sch. H-1)	Miscellaneous Revenues¹ (Sch. H-1)	Total Operating Revenues	Operating Expenses	Operations & Maintenance Expense	mortization Exp	Income Taxes	Property Taxes	Other Taxes	Total Operating Expenses	Taxable Income	Net Operating Income	Interest Expense	

	E	Direct Private Fire		26,721	1,108	27,829		29,018	34,657	(27,818)	1,269	888	38,013		(55,091)	(10,184)	17 080	50.		460,761		-2.21%
	<u>[</u>	Other		\$ 650,603	- 1	530,172 \$		278,894	76,982	40,587	24,171	8,534	429,169 \$		80,379	101,003 \$	2	1		1,650,367 \$		6.12%
	[a]	Industrial		1,610,759 \$	66,804	1,677,563 \$		381,444	38,089	575,371	76,483	11,672	1,083,059 \$		1,139,471	594,504 \$	30.403	Oct 'co		819,738 \$		72.52%
Casa Grande	[0]	Commercial		3,302,139 \$	[	3,439,091 \$		1,244,124	306,200	736,426	156,794	38,071	2,481,615 \$		1,458,427	957,476 \$	225 475	011007		6,348,904 \$		15.08%
	[8]	Residential	,	\$,769,566 \$	363,706	9,133,272 \$		5,234,586	1,648,097	259,566	416,403	160,181	7,718,832 \$		514,047	1,414,440 \$	1 150 050	200'001'1		31,274,922 \$		4.52%
	[4]	Adjusted <u>Total</u>	,	14,218,244 \$	- 1	14,807,926 \$		7,168,065	2,104,025	1,584,132	675,120	219,346	11,750,688 \$		3,137,233	3,057,238 \$	1 504 137	101,100,1		40,554,693 \$		7.54%
				s	¢	<b>∌</b>							ψ.			s				· •		
			Revenues	Water Revenues (Sch. H-1)	Miscellaneous Revenues ' (Sch. H-1)	l otal Operating Kevenues	Expenses	Operations & Maintenance Expense	Depreciation & Amortization Expense	Income Taxes	Property Taxes	Taxes	Total Operating Expenses		Taxable Income	Net Operating Income	Interset Evnence			ase		Rate of Return
			Operating Revenues	Water	Miscell	<u>o</u>	Operating Expenses	Operat	Deprec	Income	Proper	Other Taxes	2		Taxabi	Net Operat	Interest	3		Rate Base		Rate of
		Line No.	α.	က	4 1	ဂ ဖ	7	80	6	9	Ξ	12	5	4	<del>5</del> 4	12	<u>8</u> 9	8	, 73	23	23	24